UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,223	03/29/2001	Vernon S. Cheng	2002268	5396

34018 7590 02/23/2005

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
77 WEST WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 2500
CHICAGO, IL 60601-1732

EXAMINER	
LE, NHAN T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2685	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/821,223	CHENG, VERNON S.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nhan T Le	2685	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 March 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 12-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 12-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 12, 14 -18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beukema (US 6,128,510) in view of Peterson et al (US 6,728,546).

As to claim 1, Beukema teaches a wireless digital communications network comprised of: a base unit (see fig. 4, number 34, col. 4, lines 49-67) that includes a first transceiver (see fig. 6, numbers 70, 70', col. 6, lines 30-49) capable of conducting wireless communications via a cordless telephone communications protocol, a microprocessor circuit (fig. 6, number 89, col. 6, lines 3-20) operably connected with the first wireless transceiver, digital storage (inherently included in the cordless base) accessible by the microprocessor, and a telephone line interface (fig. 4, number 38) capable of receiving audio signals from the microprocessor; a cordless telephone handset (fig. 4, number 33, col. 4, lines 49-67), which handset includes a second wireless transceiver capable of conducting voice telephony via the cordless telephone communications protocol with the first transceiver; a digital electronic device (see fig. 4, number 30, col. 4, lines 49-67) that includes a third wireless transceiver (see fig. 4, number 32, col. 4, lines 49-67). Beukema fails to teach the third wireless transceiver

that communicates digital data other than that required for voice telephony with the first transceiver via the cordless telephone communications protocol. Petersen teaches the digital electronic device that includes the wireless transceiver that communicates digital data other than that required for voice telephony with the first transceiver via the cordless telephone communications protocol (see fig. 10, number 103, col. 18, lines 19-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Peterson into the system of Beukema in order to transmit and receive digitized photo data (as suggested by Petersen col. 17, lines 53-55)

As to claim 2, the combination of Beukema and Peterson teaches the digital electronic device is a general purpose computer system (see Peterson fig. 4, number 30, col. 4, lines 49-67).

As to claim 5, the combination of Beukema and Peterson teaches the computer is further comprised of a microphone for audio input and an audio output, and voice data is routed (see Peterson fig. 5, numbers 33, 38, 40, 62, col. 5, lines 1-29) between the computer microphone and audio output and the base unit telephone line interface, via the third transceiver and the first transceiver, to conduct voice telephony.

As to claim 6, the combination of Beukema and Peterson teaches the digital electronic device further includes an audio input that routes voice data to the third transceiver for transmission to the first transceiver, and an audio output that receives voice data from the third transceiver transmitted by the first transceiver (see Peterson fig. 5, numbers 33, 38, 40, 62, col. 5, lines 1-29), whereby voice telephony can be

conducted with the digital electronic device through the base unit telephone line interface.

As to claim 7, the combination of Beukema and Peterson teaches the base unit is further comprised of a second communications port (see Peterson col. 5, lines 45-65) through which the microprocessor communicates with a digital communications network, whereby digital data communications can occur between the digital communications network and the digital electronic device.

As to claim 8, the combination of Beukema, Peterson teaches the digital communication network includes connectivity with the Internet (see Peterson col. 7, lines 24-50).

As to claim 12, the combination of Beukema and Peterson inherently teaches the base unit, cordless telephone handset and digital electronic device are each associated with a unique device identification number since each device is automatically assigned with a unique identification number by the manufacture factory.

As to claims 14, 15, the combination of Buekema, Peterson teaches the digital electronic device is a portable display tablet further comprised of a flat-panel LCD display screen (see fig. 10, number 98, col. 17, lines 64-67, col. 18, lines 1-18), and a video driver circuit (see fig. 10, number 108, col. 17, lines 64-67, col. 18, lines 1-18) that displays data received from the third transceiver on the LCD display screen.

As to claim 16, the combination of Beukema and Peterson further teaches the first wireless transceiver communicates voice data with the second transceiver while simultaneously communicating non-voice data with the third transceiver, where voice

data means data representative of audio data and control data appurtenant to the communication of data representative of an audio signal (see Peterson col. 12, lines 36-67).

As to claim 17, the combination of Beukema and Peterson further teaches the digital electronic device is further comprised of means for displaying data received by the third transceiver (see Perterson fig. 10, number 98, col. 17, lines 64-67, col. 18, lines 1-18).

As to claim 18, the combination of Beukema and Peterson teaches the base unit for communicating digital data with digital data communication network (see Peterson col. 10, lines 6-24) and connecting to internet access (see Peterson col. 7, lines 24-50). However, the combination of Beukema and Perterson fails to teach the base station further comprised of an email client that receives email from and transmits email to the second digital communications network via the base unit communication port. The examiner takes Official Notice that base station connecting to email client is known in the art for communicating data from the base unit processor to a digital data communication network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Beukema and Peterson for connecting base station with email client in order to send or receive emails.

2. Claims 3, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beukema (US 6,128,510) in view of Peterson et al (US 6,728,546) further in view of Huang (US 6,675,027).

As to claim 3, the combination of Beukema and Peterson fails to fails to teach the digital electronic device is a personal digital assistant. Huang teaches the digital electronic device is a personal digital assistant (see col. 3, lines 10-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Huang into the system of Beukema and Peterson so that the personal digital assistant can be controlled by the cordless base station.

As to claim 4, the combination of Beukema, Peterson, and Huang further teaches the personal digital assistant is further comprised of an audio input and an audio output, and voice data is routed (see Huang, fig. 3, numbers 85, 86, col. 5, lines 28-42) between the personal digital assistant audio input and output and the base unit telephone line interface, via the third transceiver and the first transceiver, to conduct voice telephony.

3. Claims 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beukema (US 6,128,510) in view of Peterson et al (US 6,728,546) further in view of Sumner (US 6,091,947).

As to claim 9, the combination of Beukema and Peterson fails to teaches the communication port as the switch telephone network; or private branch communication network, or another wireless communication network, or an Internet-like which is connecting to the base by modem. Sumner teaches the communication port as the switch telephone network; or private branch communication network, or another wireless communication network, or an Internet-like which is connecting to the base by modem (see fig. 1, number 104, col. 3, lines 24-46). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Sumner into the system of Buekema and Perterson in order to provide users with different services. However, the combination of Beukema, Peterson and Sumner fails to teach the communication port is disposed on an expansion module that can be alternately installed into or removed from the base unit. The examiner takes Official Notice that the claim limitation is well known in the art to provide a flexible communication network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Sumner for having the communication port which is disposed on an expansion module that can be alternately installed into or removed from the base unit in order to provide a flexible communication network.

As to claim 10, the combination of Beukema, Peterson fails to teach the communication network in which the base unit is comprised of analog dada modem. Sumner teaches communication port which is connected to the base by the modem (see Sumner fig. 1, number 104, col. 3, lines 24-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Sumner into the system of Buekema and Perterson in order to provide users with different services. However the combination of Beukema, Peterson and Sumner fails to teach analog or digital modem. The examiner takes Official Notice that analog modem is known in the art for communicating data from the base unit processor to a digital data communication network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of

Sumner for providing the analog modem in order to communicate data from the base unit processor to a second digital communication network.

4. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beukema (US 6,128,510) in view of Peterson et al (US 6,728,546) further in view of Kim (US 5,420,577).

As to claim 13, the combination of Beukema and Peterson fails to teach the data communicated between the first transceiver and third transceiver is encrypted using a variable encryption key. Kim teaches the data communicated between the first transceiver and third transceiver is encrypted using a variable encryption key (see col. 1, lines 46-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Kim into the system of Beukema and Peterson in order to enhance the communication network security.

5. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beukema (US 6,128,510) in view of Peterson et al (US 6,728,546) further in view of Reeds (US 5,172,414).

As to claim 19, the combination of Beukema and Peterson fails to teach the base unit is further comprised of a first encryption key for encrypting data transmitted to the digital electronic device, and a second encryption key for encrypting data transmitted to the second communications network. Reeds teach the base unit is further comprised of a first encryption key for encrypting data transmitted to the digital electronic device, and a second encryption key for encrypting data transmitted to the second communications network (see col. 3, lines 35-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Reeds into the system of Beukema and Peterson in order to enhance the communication network security.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10, 12-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gerszberg et al (US 6,728,546) teaches video phone form facter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhan T Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4538. The examiner can normally be reached on 08:00-05:00 (Mon-Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on 703-305-4385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nhan Le

Nguyen Vo
2-22-2005

NGUYEN T. VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER